Mr. J. APPAJI GOWDA.—That is the total number.

Mr. T. M. KHAN.—But how many are given scholarships purely out of the grant from Government?

Mr. J. APPAJI GOWDA.—The question was about the total number of scholarships awarded.

Mr. K. CHENGALARAYA REDDY.—An increase in the amount of scholarships sanctioned to Depressed Classes is noticeable in 1932-33, 1939-40 and 1940-41. Was this increase based on any special orders of Government passed in the matter or was it a result of any increase in the allotment made for scholarships in the usual course?

Mr. J. APPAJI GOWDA.—Forty-five scholarships had been allotted to students in the Sri Narasimharaja Hostel. The board charges of the students were being adjusted out of the scholarships. Subsequently, Government undertook to bear those charges so that a larger amount became available for giving scholarships. Secondly, the Central Adikarnataka Institute at Mysore was abolished and a portion of the savings was allotted for additional scholarships.

Supply of Electricity to Bagepalli Taluk.

Q.—35. **Mr. CHIKKAGANGA REDDY** (Bagepalli—Rural).—

Will the Government be pleased to state :—

(*a*) how the question of supplying electricity to Bagepalli Taluk is disposed of;

(*b*) in how many days will arrangements be made to supply electricity to this taluk ;

(*c*) the number of wells that are in need of electric power in Bagepalli Taluk?

A.—**The SECRETARY to GOVERNMENT, ELECTRICAL DEPARTMENT (Mr. M. G. Mehkri).**—

(*a*) Is being considered by the Electrical Department.

(*b*) This cannot be definitely said in view of the difficulty of obtaining the required materials due to War.

(*c*) About 50.

Mr. K. CHENGALARAYA REDDY.—Since how long is the question of supplying electricity to the taluk being considered by Government?

Mr. M. G. MEHKRI.—Notice.

Mr. K. CHENGALARAYA REDDY.—Is it due to costliness or non-availability of materials that the scheme has not been finally considered?

The MINISTER for REVENUE and FINANCE (Rajamantrapravina K. V. Anantaraman).—It is due to the non-availability of materials, which in turn was to due to the War.

Mr. K. CHENGALARAYA REDDY.—When the required materials were available, before the War, why was the question not definitely considered?

Mr. K. V. ANANTARAMAN.—Other more urgent works must have received priority of consideration.

Mr. K. CHENGALARAYA REDDY.—As soon as materials become available again, will the question be considered and electricity supplied?

Mr. K. V. ANANTARAMAN.—Yes, subject to the usual consideration of relative urgency.

Mr. Bhupalam R. CHANDRASEKHARAYYA.—Cannot the materials be manufactured locally?

Mr. M. G. MEHKRI.—It is not so easy.

Another MEMBER.—Should all the materials come from outside or only some of them?

Mr. M. G. MEHKRI.—The more important of them have to come from outside.

Supersessions in the Revenue Department.

Q.—45. **Mr. G. NANJUNDAPPA** (Nanjangud—Rural).—

Will the Government be pleased to state :—

(*a*) how many Revenue Probationers were taken for the past eight years ;

(*b*) how many have been directly appointed as Amildars ;

(*c*) how many were so taken from the Revenue and other departments ;

(*d*) out of these Revenue Probationers, how many have since been promoted as Assistant Commissioners;

(*e*) (i) while so promoting, how many permanent Amildars have been superseded; (ii) the length of their service?

A.—**The CHIEF SECRETARY to GOVERNMENT (Rajasevaprasakta B.T. Kesavaiengar).**—

(*a*) 34.
(*b*) 6.
(*c*) 6.
(*d*) 1.
(*e*) 42.

(i) and (ii) *Vide* Mysore Civil List corrected up to 1st July 1941.

Mr. Kadidal MANJAPPA GOWDA.—One of the Revenue Probationers was promoted as an Assistant Commissioner. What were the circumstances under which he was made to supersede a large number of Amildars?

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR.—There is no question of supersession. In the case of promotions to the Assistant Commissioner's grade, efficiency, qualification and service are taken into consideration and certain local tests have also to be passed by Amildars. Some Amildars will not have passed these examinations and their cases are therefore passed over. In some cases, promotions are withheld for other valid grounds.

Another MEMBER.—In the case referred to, what were the special circumstances under which the gentlemen superseded as many as 42 Amildars?

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR.—All I can say is that there were certain special considerations.

The MEMBER.—May I know his name?

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR.—Mr. Louis De Souza.

Mr. K. HANUMANTHIAH.—Of the 34 Revenue Probationers taken, how many were related to either existing or retired Government officers?

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR.—Notice.

Mr. K. HANUMANTHIAH.—Did the Government try to find out how many of them were so related?

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR,—No.

Mr. K. HANUMANTHIAH.—Why not?

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR.—I cannot give reasons for all that was not done.

Mr. C. SUBBANNA NAIK.—Were all of them appointed in accordance with the rules of recruitment?

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR.—More or less on the same principles which govern appointments under the C.R.B. rules. But these appointments come under what may be described as Government patronage, and so the recruitment rules are not strictly applicable in making these appointments.

Mr. C. SUBBANNA NAIK.—Were the appointments made with due deference to the claims of the different communities?

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR.—No.

Mr. S. RAMAPPA.—Before the gentleman who was named a little while ago was appointed as an Assistant Commissioner, had he been confirmed at least as a Deputy Amildar?

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR.—He was not a Deputy Amildar, if I remember right.

Mr. S. RAMAPPA.—For how long was he an Amildar?

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR.—Notice.

Mr. S. RAMAPPA.—When was he appointed as an Amildar?

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR.—In 1937, probably.

Mr. S. RAMAPPA.—Had he passed all the prescribed tests before he was promoted as an Assistant Commissioner?

Mr. PRESIDENT.—I do not think we should go on discussing the merits of individual officers of Government on the floor of the House.

Mr. S. RAMAPPA.—Ignoring the claims of several persons who have put in long service, the Government have promoted one particular officer, and that is why these questions arise?

Mr. M. N. JOIS.—Is that particular officer related to any high officer of Government?

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR.—No.

Mr. M. N. JOIS.—Was not a relation of his a member of a committee appointed by Government in the recent past?

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR.—Yes.

Mr. M. N. JOIS.—Which was that committee?

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR.—The Viduraswatha Disturbances Enquiry Committee.

Mr. M. N. JOIS.—When was the report of that committee published and when was this officer promoted as an Assistant Commissioner?

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR.—Notice.

A MEMBER.—Is he a Mysorean?

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR.—Yes.

Mr. M. SITHARAMA SASTRI.—Have any of the 42 Amildars complained to Government against their alleged supersession?

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR.—No.

Mr. K. CHENGALARAYA REDDY.—Are they entitled to complain, being servants of Government?

Mr. K. SUBBIAH SETTY.—What superior qualifications did he possess, which the other Amildars did not possess, to enable him to go over their heads? Or, was any meritorious service rendered by him in consideration of which he was considered deserving of such promotion?

Mr. PRESIDENT.—No answer can be given to that question.

Mr. K. SUBBIAH SETTY.—On what considerations was he promoted as an Assistant Commissioner?

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR.—The papers are not before me just now.

A MEMBER.—Was not one of the remaining Revenue Probationers better qualified than he?

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR.—I note that the member is expressing an opinion.

Mr. Bhupalam R. CHANDRASEKHARAYYA.—In answer to (*e*), reference is invited to the Civil List. Are copies of the Civil List supplied to all the members?

Mr. PRESIDENT.—That will be an appropriate subject for the House Committee to consider.

The House adjourned for lunch at 3 p.m., and reassembled at 3-45 p.m.

Miscellaneous Matters.

Mr. K. HANUMANTHIAH brought to notice that people were finding it difficult to get tickets for admission to the Visitors' Gallery of the Assembly Hall. He also wanted to know whether it was a fact that it had been decided not to provide seats for students in the gallery.

The PRESIDENT observed that the restricted issue of tickets was necessitated by the limited accommodation available in the Visitors' Gallery. Even if each member recommended only one visitor, accommodation would have to be provided for more than 300 visitors, in addition to local residents who might also wish to attend the Sessions. The only solution of the difficulty would be to provide a separate hall for the Assembly, but that would necessarily take some time. Meanwhile, visitors were being admitted to the extent possible. However this matter could usefully be discussed by the House Committee which was going to be constituted presently.

Mr. K. NANJUNDA RAO complained that the agenda papers had not reached the members in time.

Mr. K. HANUMANTHIAH pointed out that according to the Standing Orders, agenda papers must reach the members 10 clear days before the date of the meeting, whereas they had actually reached them only seven days before that date. He said that he was bringing this to notice merely with a view to suggesting that the same indulgence be shown to the members whose amendments might not have reached the office well in time, so that they might not be rejected in strict accordance with the rules.

Mr. Bhupalam R. CHANDRASEKHARAYYA stated that some amendments had already been rejected as being too late.

The PRESIDENT replied that if discretion had been vested in him, he would certainly have exercised it in favour of the members.

Notice of Adjournment Motion.

At this stage **Mr. K. CHENGALARAYA REDDY** invited the attention of the President to an adjournment motion of which he and certain other members had

given notice and requested permission to move the same.

The motion read as follows :—

"That the business of the House be adjourned to discuss a definite urgent matter of public importance, to wit, the anomalous situation that has arisen as a result of the recent judgment of the High Court in Mis. Appeal No. 21 of 41-42 on its file, which has rendered two obviously inconsistent interpretations of the same Electoral Role one by the High Court, and the other by many Returning Officers, to hold the field at the same time."

The PRESIDENT disallowed the motion. While disallowing it, he remarked that it was not usual for the Assembly, consistent with recognised legislative practice, to carry on discussion which might occasion, however incidentally, comments on judicial decisions; that a substantive resolution (No. 35) suggesting a revision of the election rules had been already included in the agenda so that the present adjournment motion, which was in the nature of an anticipatory motion, was not admissible under Standing Order No. 20 (iv); and that while adjournment motions were designed to enable members to express their views by way of comment on particular actions or policies of Government, the present motion related to a matter of interpretation by a court of law in the exercise of its judicial functions.

Mr. K. CHENGALARAYA REDDY requested that he might be kindly permitted to explain the general effect of the High Court judgment on the country at large.

Mr. S. C. MALLIAH rose to a point of order and said that as the President had given his ruling already, it was not open to any member to discuss the matter any further.

The PRESIDENT agreed that further discussion on the matter could not be permitted.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS—BILLS.

1. The Mysore Labour Bill.

The SECRETARY to GOVERNMENT, DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT (Mr. V. Vedavyasacharya) explained the principles of the Bill as follows :—

There was till recently in Mysore no machinery for the settlement of industrial disputes. The increasing number of such disputes and the loss occasioned thereby to the employees, the employed and the public at large required that methods should be devised for preventing the occurrence of lightning strikes and lock-outs and securing their speedy termination when they occur.

In British India, as early as 1926, the Trade Union Act was passed into law and in 1929 the Trade Disputes Act was passed. The former Act legalises the formation of trade unions and gives protection to their legitimate activities. The Trade Disputes Act, 1929, provides for the constitution of Courts of Inquiry and Boards of Conciliation to examine trade disputes and endeavour to bring about a settlement and submit a report. Such report by the Court or Board is not binding on the parties. Reliance is placed on the force of public opinion which is expected to be framed on the basis of the report.

While helping the investigation of points in dispute such a procedure did not help to bring about a settlement. In 1938 legislation was taken up in Bombay designed to bring about settlement by conciliation and arbitration. By the Bombay Act, an award by an arbitrator is made binding on the parties to the arbitration, but reference to arbitration can be only at the request or approval of both the parties to a dispute. That Act has elaborate provisions for recognition of Unions and similar matters.

In Mysore, strikes and lock-outs have been unfortunately frequent of late. The report of *Rajasevaprasakta* A.V. Ramanathan, who was appointed to go into the question of the recent strike at the Binny Mills in Bangalore and the report of *Rajamantrapravina Diwan Bahadur* K. Matthan, who was appointed to enquire into the condition of labour in the Gold Fields at Kolar, both stressed the necessity for legislation to prevent lightning strikes and ensuring prompt settlement of trade disputes. A committee was appointed by Government on 10th June 1941 to consider the question. The committee consisted of representatives of employers and workmen and Government Officers